



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/583,902

06/21/2006

Alain Burgos

11123.0107USWO

7368

23552 7590 11/25/2009
MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

KATAKAM, SUDHAKAR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/583,902	Applicant(s) BURGOS ET AL.	
	Examiner SUDHAKAR KATAKAM	Art Unit 1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-21, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-21, 25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the application

1. Receipt of Applicant's Remarks and Arguments filed on 9 Nov 2009 is acknowledged. However, the arguments for the rejections are not found persuasive and as such, the previous rejection has been maintained for the reasons of record made on 31st Dec 2008. The newly added claims 25-26 are also addressed in this action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 9 Nov 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the Johnson process has two different reaction steps in making eneamide derivatives, Johnson alleges to produce a moderate to good yield (40-85%) during step (A), and Johnson et al uses a molar proportion of the catalyst which is twice that of the oxime.

Johnson et al clearly suggested, to a skilled person in the art, a process for the production of enamide derivatives, prepared by reduction of oximes with a reducing metal in the presence of an acylating agent. The catalyst used is a complex of a transition metal M^{2+} and a chiral phosphine ligand. The reaction temperature is at moderate temperatures = 75°C, with moderate to good yields (40-85%, unoptimized) and in a high state of purity. **Johnson et al** also exemplifies the synthesis of N-(3,4-dihydronaphthalen-1-yl)-acetamide using Fe as the catalyst. Included is a washing step containing sodium hydroxide and the acyl derivative (acetic anhydride and acetic acid) is used as the solvent.

With regard to process steps, one step process is obvious over two step process, because in the one pot process the multi-steps manipulated in one step, which mean the reactant and intermediates further proceed to the next step for the completion to achieve the final product.

With regard to the applicants' comparative experiments and statements on the difference in reaction process, please note that the mere statements by the inventors are not supported by evidence. These should be in the form of either a declaration or an affidavit.

With regard to applicants newly added claims 25-26, **Johnson et al** showed the reaction with various concentrations of catalyst (Fe powder), which also reflected in the product yield [see Examples]. Therefore, the prior art recognizes the concentration range, which is result effective. **Johnson et al** also suggested the compounds include a ring structure formed by R¹ and R³ [see page 4, lines 15-17], and also R¹ is preferably an aryl group [see page 4, lines 30-32].

Applicants show how each cited reference differ from the instant invention, but the obviousness test under 35 U.S.C. 103 is whether the invention would have been obvious in view of the prior art taken as a whole. In re Metcalf et al. 157 U.S.P.Q. 423.

Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In

Art Unit: 1621

this case, it is permissible for the Examiner to rely on disclosures, which fairly teach embodiments of Applicant's invention. The claims require a multitude of elements and it is reasonable for one of ordinary skill in the art to consider these elements being used together.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 12-21 and 25-26 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Johnson et al** (WO 99/18065), in view of **Tinsley et al** (US 3,375,287) for the reasons of record as set forth in the office action on 31st Dec 2008.

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136 (a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1621

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no even, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

7. No claim is allowed in absence of a clear delineation of the claims from the prior art and a side by side showing of unexpected results commensurate in scope of the claims.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sudhakar Katakam whose telephone number is 571-272-9929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Sullivan can be reached on 571-272-0779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Application/Control Number: 10/583,902

Page 6

Art Unit: 1621

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sudhakar Katakam/
Examiner, Art Unit 1621

/Karl J. Puttlitz/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621